

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed October 21, 2009, finally rejecting all of the pending claims in the application. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020049912 to Honjo et al. ("*Honjo*"). Claims 2-21, 31-33 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Honjo* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030172270 to Newcombe et al. ("*Newcombe*").

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his patience and assistance during the telephone interview of November 18, 2009, between the Examiner and the undersigned. During the interview, the Examiner agreed with Applicants' prior argument that *Honjo*, specifically *Honjo's* paragraph [0014], does not disclose performing authentication by communicating information between *Honjo's* www server and ticket granting server. Rather, the *Honjo's* client communicates independently with each server. The Examiner also indicated that the language of claims 1, 4, and 13 was confusing, but did not read on *Honjo*. The Examiner also suggested incorporating the language of claim 32 into claims 1, 4, and 13 and their dependent claims in order to clarify these claims. The Examiner also noted that the user of "terminal" in the claims was also confusing. Finally, the Examiner suggested including granting access to information into claims 1, 4 and 13 in order to avoid a 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. Again, Applicants thank the Examiner for his suggestions and believe that the amendments herein are consistent with those discussed during the interview. More specifically, Applicants have amended the independent claims to include those features suggested by the Examiner.

As discussed during the Interview, claim 32 recites "A providing server comprising: . . . apparatus authentication

information providing means for providing said apparatus authentication information or said source information to an apparatus authentication server for authenticating said client device." As acknowledged by the Examiner in the interview, *Honjo* does not disclose a server providing source information to an authentication server for authentication as in claim 32. *Newcombe* fails to make up for this deficiency in *Honjo*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of this claim. As claims 33 and 38 depend from claim 32, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of this claim as well.

Independent claims 1, 4, and 13 include language similar to that of claims 32. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims as well. Finally, claims 2-3, 5-12, and 14-21 depend from claims 1, 4, and 13 respectively, and for at least the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims as well.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the pending rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 10/562,404

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-389

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Noelle L. Cacciabeve/

Noelle L. Cacciabeve

Registration No.: 63,075

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants